



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, April, 1894.

PECOCK'S 'REPRESSOR' AND THE WICLIF BIBLE.

IN the introduction to his edition of Pecock's 'Repressor' for the Rolls Series, Churchill Babington makes the following assertion:

"In the majority of Scripture citations, Pecock employs the version ascribed to Wiclif, in that form of it, however, which is the later of the two. . . ." (*Introduction*, p. xxviii.)

He adds in a note:

"See 'Repressor,' part v, ch. i, more especially. The exceptions to this remark are mostly confined to short texts quoted apparently *memoriter*, such as occur in the first sixty pages."

A somewhat careful comparison of the Scripture citations in the 'Repressor' with the Wiclif Bible reveals the fact that of about one hundred and fifty passages, but thirty-two are quoted exactly. Of course the phrase, "employs the version ascribed to Wiclif," may admit very wide divergence from that version, and might be extended to mere paraphrase. In that sense, Pecock may be said to employ the Wiclif version, but it is doubtful if in any other sense. Yet the editor's use of the word "quoted" in his note implies a much more limited meaning in his phrase than I have suggested.

His statement, however, that the remark is especially true of the fifth part, first chapter, must be confirmed without qualification. From this point to the close, the citations are nearly exact. But it must be remembered that this is less than one-sixth of the work. Nor is it to be inferred that all the exact or nearly exact citations are to be found in this fifth part, as they are distributed pretty evenly through the two volumes?

The second statement of Mr. Babington's note is more doubtful. It can hardly be proved that the exceptions to his introductory remark "are mostly confined to short texts quoted apparently *memoriter*, such as occur in the first sixty pages." All but one of the examples of maximum divergence given below have been chosen from the first sixty pages,

and cannot, I think, fail to raise the question whether they can be satisfactorily accounted for by the theory of *memoriter* quotations. If they may, it is only by a greater extension of the term "quotation" than is ordinarily made. Nor are such divergences confined to the first sixty pages, for at page 389 (Wisdom, 5. 16) and at page 440 (Matt. 16. 16-19) are divergences as great as any that I have instanced. It must, however, be admitted that the longer citations are more accurate than the shorter ones, and that, as the work proceeds, a greater exactness in quotation is evident.

The following collated passages are designed, therefore, to raise the question whether, under any ordinary conception of the term "quotation," Pecock may be said to have quoted from the Wiclif Bible; that is, whether such wide divergence was voluntary or involuntary, and, if the former, on what theory it can be explained.

EXAMPLES OF AVERAGE DIVERGENCE.

Luke 6. 42. 'Repressor,' p. 3.

Pecock.—"Ypocrite, take first the beam out of thine owne iȝe and thanne thou schalt se forto take the mote out of thin neiȝboris iȝe."

*Wiclif.—"Ipocrite, first take out the beam of thin iȝe, and thanne thou schalt se to take the moot of thi brotheris iȝe."

Jas. 1. 21. 'Repressor,' p. 68.

Pecock.—"Take ȝe or receyue ȝe this graffid word which may saue ȝoure soulis."

Wiclif.—"Resseyue ȝe the word that is plauntid that may saue ȝoure soulis."

John 8. 31. 'Repressor,' p. 103.

Pecock.—"Iesus seid to hem¹ of the Iewis, whiche bileeueden to² him: 'If ȝe schulens dwelle in my word ȝe schulen be my very discipulis and ȝe schulen knowe trouthe⁴ and trouthe schal delyueres ȝou.'"

¹ A MS. of the earlier version of Wiclif's Bible has *hem*, *the*.—² Earlier version, *in to*.—³ Earlier version, *schulen dwelle*.—⁴ A MS. of the later version omits *the*.—⁵ Earlier version, *delyuere*.

* I quote in every case from the later Wiclif version.

Wiclif.—“Jhesus seide to the¹ Jewis, that bileueden in² hym, ‘If ge dwellen³ in my word, verili ge schulen be my disciplis; and ge schulen knowe the⁴ treuthe, and the treuthe schal makes gou fre.’”

John 3. 19, 20. ‘Repressor,’ p. 97.

Pecock.—“This is the judgem nt, for līgt came in to the world, and men loued more derknis than līgt, sotheli¹ her werkis weren yuel. Forsothe² ech that doith yuel hatith līgt, and he comith not to līgt, that hise werkis ben not vndernome.³ He that doith treuthe cometh to līgt, that hise werkis be mad open, for⁴ that thei ben doon in God.”

Wiclif.—“And this is the dom, for līgt cam in to the world, and men loueden more derknissis than līgt; for¹ her werkes were yuell. For² ech man that doith yuele, hatith the līgt; and he cometh not to the līgt, that hise werkes be not repreued.³ But he that doith treuthe, cometh to the līgt, that hise werkes be schewid, that⁴ thei ben don in God,”

EXAMPLES OF MINIMUM DIVERGENCE.

II Tim. 4. 2. ‘Repressor,’ p. 1.

Pecock.—“Vndirnymye thou, biseche thou, and blame thou in al pacience and doctrine.”

Wiclif.—“Repreue thou, biseche thou, blame thou in al pacience and doctryn.”

Gen. 41. 26, 27. ‘Repressor,’ p. 258.

Pecock.—“The vij faire kijn and the vij ful eeris of corn ben vij geeris of plente; and the vij kijn thynne and leene, whiche stieden up after tho, and the vij thinne eeris of corn and smytyn with brennyng wijnd ben vij geeris of hungir to comyng.”

Wiclif.—“Seuene faire kiyn, and seuene ful eeris of corn, ben seuene geeris of plentee . . . ; and seuene kiyn thinne and leene, that stieden aftir tho and seuene thinne eeris of corn and smytyn with brennyng wynd, ben seuene geer of hungur to comyng. . . .”

Col. 2. 5, 7. ‘Repressor,’ p. 232.

Pecock.—“Thouȝ y be absent in bodi, ȝit bi spirit y am with ȝou, ioiying and seyng goure

¹ Earlier version, *forsoth*.—² Earlier version, *sothe*. *li*.—³ Earlier version, *repreued or undirnomun*.—⁴ Earlier version, *for*.

ordre and the sadnes of ȝoure bileeue which is in Crist.”

Wiclif.—“For thouȝ Y be absent in bodi, bi spirit y am with ȝou, ioiying and seyng ȝoure ordre and the sadnesse of ȝoure bileue that is in Crist.”

I Cor. 14. 38. ‘Repressor,’ p. 53.

Pecock.—“Sotheli,¹ if eny man unknowith, he schal be unknowun.”

Wiclif.—“And¹ if ony man unknowith he schal be unknowen.”

EXAMPLES OF MAXIMUM DIVERGENCE.

II Cor. 4. 3, 4. ‘Repressor,’ p. 54.

Pecock.—“That and if oure Euangelie is couered, it is couered to hem whiche spillen; in which¹ God of this world hath blindid the myndis or wittis of unfeithful men, that the līgting or cleering of the Euangelie of the glorie of Crist, which is the ymage of God, schine not.”

Wiclif.—“For if also ouere gospel is kyuerid, in these that perischen it is kyuerid; in which¹ God hath blent the soulis of vnfeithful men of this world, that the līgtning of the gospel of the glorie of Crist, which is the ymage of God, schyne not.”

Rom. 10. 12. ‘Repressor,’ p. 2.

Pecock.—“zeel of good wille but not aftir kunnyng.”

Wiclif.—“loue of God, but not aftir kunnynge.”

Isa. 66. 2. ‘Repressor.’ p. 6.

Pecock.—“To whom schal y beholde¹ but to a² litle pore man, broken in herte, and³ trembling at my wordis?”

Wiclif.—“To whom schal y beholde¹ no but to a² pore man and contrit in spirit and³ greetli dredyng my wordis?”

Prov. 25. 16, 27. ‘Repressor,’ p. 68.

¹ Earlier version, *Forsothe*.

¹ Vulgate—*Deus hujus saeculi*.

¹ No MS. of Wiclif has “zeel of good wille.” Vulgate, *aemulationem Dei*.

¹ Earlier version, *but*.—² Earlier version, *my porelet*.—³ Earlier version, *trembling my wordis*. Vulgate, *pauperulum, et contritum spiritu, et trementem sermones meos*.

Pecock.—“Thou hast founde hony, ete therof what is ynoug and no more; lest thou ouer fillid caste it up out agen and thanne is it to thee vilonie: Forto ete miche of hony is not good to the eter.”

Wiclif.—“Thou hast founde hony, ete thou that that suffisith to thee: lest perauenture thou be fillid, and brake it out. As it is not good to hym that etith myche hony.”

A gleam of light may be thrown on the problem by the fact that, in four of the twelve instances given above, Pecock's variations agree exactly, or very nearly, with the reading of one or more manuscripts of the earlier version of the Wiclif Bible.

It is with some hesitation that I advance the following theory: that, in the case of maximum divergence, we have in Pecock practically a new translation, based probably upon Wiclif; in the case of minimum divergence, we have citations made *memoriter*, in some instances, at least, with the Vulgate in mind; in the case of average divergence, we must hesitate between these two extremes.

It is interesting to note Pecock's evident preference for *which* as a relative, over *that*. In no less than twenty instances he uses the former where Wiclif employs the latter. Examples may be found among the citations given above (cf. Jas. 1. 21; John 8. 31; Gen. 41. 26, 27; Col. 2. 5, 7; II Cor. 4. 3, 4).

CHARLES H. A. WAGER.

Yale University.

THE TEXT OF FAUST.

II. 718 f.

PROFESSOR Cutting in a 'Note to Goethe's Faust' in the February number of the MOD. LANG. NOTES calls in question the punctuation of lines 718 and 719 as given in the standard Weimar edition:

“Zu diesem Schritt sich heiter zu entschliessen
Und, w: es mit Gefahr, ins Nichts dahin zu fliessen.”

The basis of this edition is Goethe's final revision in the 'Ausgabe letzter Hand,' and the editors sought simply to reproduce the text as Goethe wished to leave it, and to which he dedicated the most painstaking attention. They permitted themselves only

minor changes in punctuation, where manifest errors or inconsistencies occurred. Peculiarities of fashion in the typography of the time were not needlessly set aside. The texts of Faust which are to be considered in determining any reading, are the editions of the collected works of 1808 (A) Bd. viii, of 1817 (B). Bd. ix, of 1828 (C^r) Bd. xii, of 1829 (C) Bd. xii, and the two single editions of 1808 (E^r) and of 1816 (E*). The text of the latter had Goethe's special revision, and was followed in B and C^r, while C was subjected to a second careful revision. Other editions can be disregarded, at least so far as determining the text of the First Part is concerned.

I have not the single edition of 1816, but as it was followed in the text of 1817, I assume that the two correspond. All these editions present the reading given above. The first complete edition of Faust of 1833 and the collected edition of the poet's works of 1836-7, published under the editorship of Eckermann and Riemer, agree with the above. We must regard the reading, therefore, as authoritative. Von Loeper in his two Hempel editions does not attempt to reproduce the original punctuation, and Düntzer is endlessly arbitrary in his treatment of Goethe's text, changing not only the punctuation, but often the forms of words, basing his course upon some subjective canon. The punctuation is not uniform in Schröder's two editions. We cannot speak of "the change from the Hempel edition," for the Weimar edition, followed by Professor Thomas, preserves properly the original reading. The interpretation of the passage by the author of the note is unquestionably correct, but the text as preserved is undoubtedly that of Goethe.

The punctuation employed is common throughout the literature. A pirated edition of 1810 presents first the reading proposed. The question may, perhaps, be raised, whether in many cases of the similar use of *und*, its purpose may not have been originally to repeat with emphasis the preceding line, equal in the above passage to, "And [to do this], even at the peril of annihilation."

The question what principles should determine the text of a modern classical writer, is one upon which scholars may hold different